

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Marilyn Roberts at 7:01 p.m., **Wednesday, February 19, 2003**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Marilyn Roberts, Chairwoman
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Eric Essex
Shakil Patel
Mary Lee Rosenbaum
Michael Christianson, Alternate

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
E. Gene Brooks, Public Safety Officer, Division Chief
Lori Ludi, Senior Planner
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Dept.
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Chair Roberts took a few minutes to discuss the agenda format changes. She explained that the approval of the minutes had been moved to the end of the meeting so that the action items involving the applicant's participation could be addressed first. She continued to say that time limits for discussions and reports had been incorporated along with staff recommendations for action items.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No oral report was presented.

CONTINUED ITEMS – PUBLIC HEARING

PC-03-04 – PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 02-01 AND VARIANCE NO. 03-01 – A request to construct fifty-seven (57) single-family residences on a 15.83-acre site located approximately 250 feet south of Barton Road, on the west side of Oakwood Drive in the R-1, Single Residence Zone (Tract Map No. 16259).

Senior Planner Ludi presented her staff report and explained that the applicant, Granite Homes, proposed to develop Tentative Tract Map No. 16259 with 57 single-family residences, which range from 2,595 square feet to 3,564 square feet. She continued to say that due to the slope of the project area, the applicant was requesting a variance to reduce the front yard setback for twenty-two of the homes.

Ms. Ludi stated that this was a continued item from the Planning Commission meeting of December 4, 2002 explaining that because of certain design issues a Subcommittee composed of Planning Commissioners and staff was formed.

As indicated above, the project is 57 single-family homes with three models of which one is a one and one-half story concept with a loft above, and the other two models are two-story. There are three different architectural styles with options.

The subcommittee and staff met with the applicant on two occasions to address the following issues:

- The grading of the project site which includes reducing the height of lots and reducing the slope of side and rear yards;
- Highly visible fencing due to the proposed slope. Also the concept of transitional fencing between the wood fences and the wrought iron;

- Side loading of corner lots;
- Garages placed behind the living areas of the house or the porch/courtyard;
- Porches on the front elevation were encouraged;
- Redesign of Plan 2 to reduce the number of garage doors within the front of the residence, address the issue of limited livable area on the first floor in the front of the house, and reduce the amount of proposed hardscape;
- Providing deciduous canopy trees that do not block view in the winter on the streets and the slopes;
- Providing a pedestrian walkway out to the sidewalk from the entry;
- Providing brighter colors in the color palette;
- Providing material and architectural variety on the side and rear elevations; and,
- Provide a pedestrian walkway to the side yard where the trash receptacles are stored and cement pad for the containers.

The revisions to the project design have not resulted in any substantive changes to the project description other than changes outlined below.

Staff still had concerns with the drainage on Lot 28. Staff suggested that this lot, along with the others along the northern tract boundary line, could be lowered by creating a 5:1 slope in the rear yard. This would allow the pad to be reduced, creating cross-lot drainage across lots 27 to 29 onto to Oakwood Ave along the northern boundary.

Ms. Ludi continued to say that the color palette was another area that had not been addressed entirely to their satisfaction adding that it might not be the most appropriate for the architectural styles designed.

Staff was also concerned that the maintenance of the proposed street light design might not be cost efficient. Staff will work with the applicant to obtain an appropriate design. This was included in the conditions of approval.

Staff had developed appropriate conditions of approval and could continue to work with the applicant to get to the plan check process and will resolve issues with the developer about particular lots concerning wrought iron fences, enhancements, and the homes that must have dens versus the one-car garages. She continued that they are pleased with the changes made by the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve Precise Plan of Design PPD 02-01 and Variance VAR 03-01 based on the Findings contained in this Staff Report, and subject to the Conditions of Approval (Attachment A).

Senior Planner Ludi explained that the variance was added during the process of the workshops with the subcommittee to provide staggering to the facades along the streetscape. She added that staff would also recommend that lots 28, 27, and 26 be moved five feet towards the street to allow for buffer zones that would bring the houses away from the northern property boundary line.

Chair Roberts stated that she would like to add some items that were discussed at the subcommittee level:

- Color palette and roofing – Asked for more variety of colors and materials and design to remain in keeping with the architectural style
- Windows, grading and trees
- Landscaping – shade trees for the street trees
- Eight corner lots with porches wrapped around the house
- Fences on corner lots
- Plan #2 with the garage on the front of the house – reduced the number of models to seven
- Four-sided architecture
- More diversity in styles and models to change the roof lines

Chair Roberts stated that the builder was working to implement the changes that the subcommittee was requesting.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she was pleased with the outcome of the meetings with the exception of Plan #2 because it fundamentally goes against the concepts that the Planning Commission was looking to obtain. She continued to say that the builder had taken steps to minimize some of the negative impact of having mostly garage doors fronting on the street.

Commissioner Essex stated that the members of the subcommittee should be thanked for all the work they did relative to this project.

Director Woldruff added to Commissioner Essex's comment that staff was very pleased that the commissioners who were willing to participate as members of the subcommittee.

Chair Roberts opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Mr. Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda, addressed the Commission, representing himself and his father, and stated that he had tried to work with the subcommittee, staff and the applicant to resolve the issue of the retaining wall, but could not support the plan proposed by Granite Homes because they had offered no mitigation in regards to the wall. He continued to say that due to the lack of progress that he had asked Mr. James DeAguilera, a Land Use Attorney to help resolve the issue.

Mr. James DeAguilera, Land Use Attorney at 2068 Orange Tree Lane, Redlands, introduced himself and commented that he had worked as the first planning director with the City of Loma Linda. He explained that he wished to make statements on the record and stated that he and Mr. Zirkle had concerns with the overall height of the wall on the north boundary that is over six feet in height. He added that there had been no request for a variance to construct the wall in excess of six feet in height in the builder's initial application. He continued to say that there are more walls to be placed on top of the retaining wall that would make the height even greater. He commented further that the CEQA document to the extent that they do not include visual impacts of walls in excess of six feet in height would be deficient. It was Mr. DeAguilera's contention that the findings were conclusionary, and not based on factual or analytical information included in the record. Mr. DeAguilera's concluded by asking the Planning Commission not to approve the project with walls in excess of six feet in height without a variance being put before them.

Mr. James Jesse, 24163 Barton Road, addressed the Commission and stated that a reasonable agreement had been reached with the builder in their situation by reducing the height of the wall from ten feet to six feet. Mr. Jesse added that the developer worked hard in their area. He also stated that he would ask that the developer place a single-story model on Lot 21 to further reduce the visual impact. He concluded by saying that their needs had been addressed on the issues of the slopes, the wall and the lot line adjustment.

Mr. Marc Gerber of Granite Homes, at 2955 Main Street in Irvine addressed the Commission and applauded the commission for appointing a subcommittee and staff for being supportive and providing input to resolve the different issues related to this project. Mr. Gerber stated that several of the consultants were present in the audience, the architect, the civil engineer, colorist and the landscape architect and ready to answer any of the questions that the Planning Commission had on the project. He continued to propose that the discussion begin by addressing the concerns in the area of grading with the help of the civil engineer Mr. Lozano.

Mr. Henry Lozano, engineer for the project, introduced himself and stated his address at 18195 McDermott Street, in Irvine. Mr. Lozano initiated a discussion regarding retaining walls and drainage issues related to slopes on Lot 28. Commissioner Rosenbaum asked about the possibility of lowering the pad of Lot 28 by 11/2 feet to lower the wall to the north. Mr. Lozano replied that the pad could not be lowered but the grade can be to the north property line. Senior Planner Ludi stated that this could be made a part of the conditions of approval.

Chair Roberts asked the Commissioners if they would agree to table this item and proceed to Item F.2 to allow the Chamber of Commerce representatives to leave at the conclusion of the item. It was the consensus of the Commission to table the discussion on Item F.1.

Chair Roberts tabled the discussion at 7:45 p.m.

NEW ITEMS – PUBLIC HEARING

PC-03-05 - DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT (DCA) NO. 03-02 – An amendment to the Loma Linda Municipal Code amending the regulations regarding temporary signage.

Senior Planner Ludi presented the staff report. She explained that during the past year, the Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) had called on Loma Linda businesses to find out what their concerns were in regards to temporary signs and to determine how the Chamber could help those businesses prosper. The Chamber designed a survey and sent it to all member businesses in Loma Linda, and the results revealed the following concerns:

- The strict regulations of the temporary sign code
- The \$85 fee for a temporary sign permit
- The 45-day current limitation for banner sign placement twice a year
- The separate permit approval and fee requirement for each banner throughout the year
- The maximum temporary sign size of 4' X 6'

Ms. Ludi explained that staff of the Community Development Department and members of the Chamber of Commerce had met on a regular basis starting in November 2002, to develop an amendment to the existing regulations that would provide much needed controls for the City, and encourage a healthy business community. The intent and purpose of the sign ordinance is “to promote commerce, traffic, safety and community identity while improving the quality of the visual environment” and to “make every business more findable, eliminate clutter and confusion and to promote visually attractive street graphics in the community.”

Ms. Ludi continued to explain that the proposed Development Code Amendment would be for the regulation of temporary signs and that Staff had prepared the proposed changes to the existing code based on input from the Chamber of Commerce. The proposed amendments pertain to the requirements for a temporary sign permit, the placement, size and material of temporary signs, and display times. The amendment would remove the requirements for grand opening events from the temporary sign regulations and place them in the Special Event permit regulations. The proposed amendment also exempts the placement of A-frame signs of a particular size and location from requiring a permit.

Ms. Ludi detailed the proposed changes had been compiled based on input from the Chamber of Commerce, and staff prepared the proposed Development Code Amendment that would include the following revisions:

- Additional definitions to clarify the types of signs and display materials in the City Code,
- Identification of permitted locations for temporary signs,
- Size increase for temporary signs from 24 sq. ft to 32 sq. ft,
- Allowing one display banner per street frontage or one per storefront,
- Change in the display periods for temporary signs from two periods of 45 days per year to four display periods of 30 days or 120 non-consecutive days per year,
- Exemptions from display periods for restaurant and drive-through establishments,
- Removing Grand Openings from temporary signs regulations to special events regulations
- New businesses that have not installed permanent signs and would like to use interim temporary signs would be exempt from the temporary sign permit process if the new permanent signs have been approved by the Community Development Department
- Exemption of A-frame signs smaller than 3 feet x 3 feet placed on private property in all commercial, industrial and institutional zones. These signs would be displayed at the beginning of business hours and removed at closing; 24-hours businesses would be able to display A-frame signs at all times.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval and adoption of the proposed Development Code Amendment for temporary signs. Additional comments and/or suggested revisions from the Planning Commission would be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.

Chair Roberts opened the public hearing at 7:50 pm.

Mr. Roo McKenzie, past President of the Loma Linda, Chamber of Commerce, 811 Concord Lane, Redlands, addressed the Commission to thank staff for their assistance. He stated that

when the Chamber of Commerce wished to discuss revisions to the sign code, staff was very open to the discussions. He continued to say that although the businesses were eager to update the sign code, it was also important to them to maintain the esthetics personality of the city. Mr. McKenzie requested the Commission to look with favor on the Development Code Amendment as proposed by staff.

Ms. Peg Karsick, Executive Director of the Loma Linda Chamber of Commerce, 1540 Smiley Heights, Redlands, addressed the Commission and read from the text of the ordinance that stated that the intent and purpose of the sign ordinance was to promote commerce, traffic, safety and community identity while improving the quality of the visual environment" and to "make every business more findable, eliminate clutter and confusion and to promote visually attractive street graphics in the community." She continued to say that those were the very things that the Chamber felt should be happening. Ms. Karsick said that she wished to echo Mr. McKenzie's appreciation for the collaboration exhibited during their meetings.

Regarding the number of banners and the display periods, Ms. Karsick stated that the business community expressed their thoughts that they would be happy with two banners and were not looking to be able to display a large number of banners and other types of signs. She added that the businesses assured the Chamber that any banner they would decide to use would be of professional quality, built to withstand weather conditions, and that these banners would enhance the look of the business community.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:55 pm.

Chair Roberts commenced the discussion and the main concerns of the Planning Commission centered on the issues of the definition of "temporary" signs, the amount of coverage of window paint, number and location of A-frame sign. In regards to questions on the method of tracking the deadlines for temporary signs, Staff responded that it is possible to track through the permit software currently being used by the Department. On the question of window signs that are painted, it seemed reasonable to continue to limit it to 25% of the window space if other types of temporary signs were allowed. Mr. McKenzie added that the businesses had stated that they would voluntarily reduce the painted area on the windows of their business.

Chief Brooks, Public Safety Department explained that a "temporary" sign was one that was removed in the evening and brought out when the business began its business day. He added that the Public Safety Department agreed with Community Development Department in that relaxing the code would be in the economic interest of the City of Loma Linda and that Code Enforcement would certainly support the application of the new code so that all businesses get fair treatment.

Commissioner Patel suggested that a trial period might be the wise solution at this time. Senior Planner Ludi stated that the City would certainly get the support of the Chamber of Commerce to make sure that the trial period would be successful.

Director Woldruff explained that any business that would want to place temporary signs would be required to complete an application and that staff would make sure that each business would follow the code before the permit would be issued. Senior Planner Ludi added that the wording of the code could be very descriptive as to issues of quantity and quality to ensure that no substandard signs were put up.

Ms. Karsick and Mr. McKenzie assured the Commission that the member businesses would be fully cooperative since they understand that it is in their best interest to follow City ordinances if they wished their businesses to be successful.

At the beginning of the discussion, Senior Planner Ludi suggested that the Planning Commission either look at each proposed amendment in the Draft of the DCA or in her staff report, as these two items contained the same discussion. She continued to say that if the Commission wished to make any changes before the issue is recommended to City Council, they would be reflected in the minutes.

Chair Roberts requested that the discussion follow each section of the proposed amendments, as opposed to the staff report, and address the issues in order.

The Commissioners had no changes to bring to Section 17.18.030 – Definitions.

Continuing on to Section 17.18.080 – Temporary Permits, Chair Roberts asked if there was a definition for “temporary”. She stated that a formal definition should be added to prevent a temporary sign from being displayed on a permanent basis. Senior Planner Ludi replied that there were two concepts, one that would address any businesses other than restaurants would be allowed to have the sign out during the display period provided, four periods of 30 days not to exceed 120 non-consecutive days, and the other option to allow all businesses including restaurant to have one temporary sign up at all times, this would allow the businesses to change signage if they were having different specials from week to week.

Commissioner Roberts stated that in the case of an A-frame signs the businesses would always be displaying a sign, therefore the sign would not be temporary, it would be considered a permanent movable sign. Ms. Ludi replied that the A-frame signs were excluded from the temporary sign section. Chair Roberts responded that an A-frame sign displayed by a restaurant would not be temporary signage, because it would be displayed all the time, it could be considered permanent even though it is a non-fixed. Ms. Ludi replied that restaurants would be exempt from display times. Chair Roberts replied that in her opinion that type of sign is a permanent sign, because it is on displayed every day. Ms. Ludi explained that A-frame signs were indicated in the permanent sign portion of the code, not the temporary portion of the code; it was an amendment to that.

Commissioner Neff said that, as he understood it, an A-frame sign is a moving sign, that can be picked up and moved, and to him that this type of sign was a temporary sign because it is not fixed permanently to a wall or other permanent fixture. Chair Roberts summarized that this was a temporary type sign not in the time frame, but in the nature of the sign where it is not a permanently fixed, illuminated type of sign.

Senior Planner Ludi asked whether the Planning Commission was interested in seeing A-frame and banner signs of every business all the time, or if they would allow restaurants to have them up all the time, or if they would like to see the display periods limited to the time frames suggested. Chair Roberts asked if, during the discussion the definition of temporary had been determined. Ms. Ludi explained that the Commission did not have to define “temporary”, they need to decide if they are interested in seeing banner signs as proposed.

Commissioner Neff proposed to use the text of the proposed amendment to help make the decision as to whether the Commissioner agreed with the changes or not. He pointed out to Senior Planner Ludi’s staff report on page 3, where it talked about “display” periods and asked the other Commissioners if they would agree with that proposed amendment.

The Planning Commission determined the regulation pertaining to display periods are necessary otherwise the signs are not temporary and become a permanent feature of the establishment. Additionally, the Commission did not recommend that restaurant uses be treated differently than other businesses and that they should be subject to the display time regulations.

Ms. Ludi stated that staff suggested that the temporary sign regulations could be relaxed for a trial period and be reevaluated during the upcoming Development Code Revision Project that should commence within one year (following the adoption of the new General Plan). The one to two-year timeframe would help City staff determine whether or not the amendments to the temporary sign regulations were appropriate, and if they met the needs of the business community.

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 5 to 1, Chair Roberts voting against, to recommend to City Council that the Development Code Amendments be approved as amended by the Planning Commission.

After a brief recess, the meeting resumed at 9:05 pm.

PC-03-04 – PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 02-01 AND VARIANCE NO. 03-01 – A request to construct fifty-seven (57) single-family residences on a 15.83-acre site located approximately 250 feet south of Barton Road, on the west side of Oakwood Drive in the R-1, Single Residence Zone (Tract Map No. 16259). (Continued)

Mr. Henry Lozano, engineer for the project had prepared another option for the issue of the grading and drainage for the sloped properties. Commissioner Rosenbaum requested that the

discussion continue on other issues while Mr. Lozano was preparing the illustration for the alternate option he was proposing.

Ms. Peggy Rhodes, of Rhodes Color Design at 506 Acacia Avenue, Corona Del Mar, California addressed the Commission and stated that if the Commissioners had any question she would be happy to answer them.

Chair Roberts explained to Ms. Rhodes that staff had recommended that the applicant propose a brighter palette of colors and materials, and that, although there was a better variety, Ms. Roberts did not see them as being brighter. Ms. Rhodes replied that she was confident that they could come to an agreement with staff. She added that they would prepare samples of materials so the Commission could see the variety of textures and colors. Chair Roberts explained that the Commission wanted final approval for the design and texture of the roof tiles.

Commissioner Rosenbaum inquired if other colors suggested during subcommittee meetings, such as yellow and blue would be among the choices for building colors. Director Woldruff requested permission to respond to the question and stated that from experience, houses that come in primary colors were not as marketable as colors that blend into the surroundings. She suggested that maybe color accents could be added to the trim to brighten the look. Ms. Rhodes added that color accents on the fascia, eaves, shutters and garage doors could definitely be added.

Mr. Lozano explained his illustration of the proposed rear yard slope alternative. He stated that providing a maximum slope of 2:1 in the rear yards adjacent to the swale along the north property line for lots 22 through 28 would alleviate the need for a tract boundary wall/retaining wall exceeding six feet in height. This was incorporated in the conditions of approval as Condition 1.30.

Condition 1.30 would read as follows:

To alleviate the need for a tract boundary wall/retaining wall exceeding six feet in height, lots 22 through 28 shall have a maximum slope of 2:1 in the rear yard adjacent to the swale along the north property line. This area shall be landscaped and equipped with an irrigation system included on the final landscape plan. A covenant and disclosure shall be recorded for lots 22 through 28 requiring that the sloped area be maintained. The covenant and disclosure documents shall be submitted to the Community Development Department and reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department and the City Attorney prior to recordation. Proof of recordation shall be provided to the Community Development Department prior to occupancy.

After further discussion, Chair Roberts stated that because of the steepness of the slope, decks extending over the slope could not be allowed. Senior Planner Ludi concurred and stated that she would add that stipulation to the Conditions of Approval.

Condition 1.29 would read as follows:

No decks shall be constructed over the slope in the rear yard on lots adjacent to the northern tract boundary line.

Mr. John Hannah, John Hannah and Associates, Landscape Architect, 444 S. Cedars Avenue, Solano Beach, addressed the Commission and stated that two street-trees on the side of the property, one street-tree in the front, and one front-yard tree were planned for corner lots. He continued to say that he wished to add a comment to the grading discussion. He explained that on the low side of the lot, at the 2-1 slope landscaping was required according to City Standards and that the applicant would provide trees for a visual screening for both adjoining properties.

Mr. Zirkle addressed the Commission to state that he was happy to see changes being made, but that he still had objections about the height of the lots.

Chair Roberts mentioned that she would like staff to add wording to the Conditions of Approval to the CC&Rs for lots to be disclosed and approved by an attorney in regards to decks being constructed over the slope for the lots along the north boundary line, and that the irrigation system and the landscaping.

In Conditions #1.4 regarding the Tract Boundary Wall, Chair Roberts suggested the removal of the last two sentences.

Condition 1.4 would read:

The perimeter wall around the tract shall be six feet tall adjacent to the east, south and west tract boundary lines.

Condition 1.5 would be removed.

Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested changes to conditions 1.13 and 1.14.

Condition 1.13 would read:

Houses on Lots 26, 27 and 28 shall be moved five feet closer to the front property line.

Condition 1.14 would read:

Houses on Lots 29, 30, 37,39, 43, 49, 50 and 57 shall not have the option for a third car garage and shall be constructed with the den/guest suite option.

Condition 3.24 would be deleted along with condition 3.44, which is a duplicate of condition 3.40.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that her greatest concern was the plan for model 2 with the three-car garages, but that she felt that the applicant had made a great concession in removing them from his proposed plans. She continued to say that it was a project she can accept but added that it was not the type of project that she would like to see in the future.

Commissioner Rosenbaum excused herself from the meeting at 9:40 pm.

Commissioner Neff asked about the storm drain on lots 16 and 17, and Mr. Lozano replied that there was an agreement in place for offsite drainage. Senior Planner Ludi added that the applicant must comply with the Conditions of Approval that were approved at the Preliminary Project stage.

Mr. Pang, 11636 Anderson Way addressed the Commission and requested the same type of arrangement that Mr. Zirkle had obtained from the applicant. Mr. Lozano replied that it was a viable request. Ms. Ludi concurred that a solution could be worked out. Director Woldruff stated that the agreement could be approved with contingencies. She continued to say that if the lot line adjustment were not acceptable, Lot 21 would be included with Lots 22 through 28.

On the subject of landscaping, Chair Roberts made the following comments.

- Street trees must be canopy/shade trees
- No Crepe Myrtle trees

Mr. Hannah presented a sample landscape plan from another project for the Commission to view and added that he would have the tree selection reviewed by the Community Development Department before a final choice was made.

Chair Roberts added the following suggestions:

- Olive trees, non fruit bearing
- Front yard irrigation required
- Black wrought fences

On the issue of streetlights, Senior Planner Ludi and Assistant Engineer Peterson stated that they would work with the applicant to select an appropriate style.

Chair Roberts also inquired about the dimensions of the cement pads for the refuse containers. She stated that the proposed pads were considerably smaller than what was agreed upon in the Subcommittee meetings. Mr. Charles Addington representing Granite Homes explained that in order to allow proper drainage in the side yard, a 4-foot pad was not possible. On a question by Associate Engineer Peterson concerning the possibility of lowering the pad to ground level, Mr. Addington replied that it was not viable solution either. Staff was directed to work with the applicant to resolve the issue.

Chair Roberts lead a discussion on the Conditions of Approval. Modifications were made to the Conditions of Approval. The text of the Conditions is being made an attachment to these minutes.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 02-01 and the Variance (VAR) No. 03-01 based on the Findings and subject to the amended Conditions of Approval. Rosenbaum absent.

PC-03-06 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Regular meeting of December 4, 2002, and the Adjourned meeting of January 22, 2003.

Motion by Neff, seconded by Christianson, and carried, to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of December 4, 2002 as presented. (Rosenbaum abstain)

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and carried, to approve the minutes of the Adjourned meeting of January 22, 2002 as presented. (Essex and Patel abstain)

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Community Development Department Director Woldruff stated that because of the late hour she would defer her report to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of May 21, 2003.

Administrative Secretary